

Book

92

MK6025

302050: Home Decor-Stationary / Books

MK602592-27



0402W0G0A5RJP

F


Compare at \$1.75

Bargain Hunt Price \$1

# **The Austro-German Hypocrisy and the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church**



PETER KOHANIK



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2022 with funding from  
Kahle/Austin Foundation





## **The Austro-German Hypocrisy and the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church**

You are holding a reproduction of an original work that is in the public domain in the United States of America, and possibly other countries. You may freely copy and distribute this work as no entity (individual or corporate) has a copyright on the body of the work. This book may contain prior copyright references, and library stamps (as most of these works were scanned from library copies). These have been scanned and retained as part of the historical artifact.

This book may have occasional imperfections such as missing or blurred pages, poor pictures, errant marks, etc. that were either part of the original artifact, or were introduced by the scanning process. We believe this work is culturally important, and despite the imperfections, have elected to bring it back into print as part of our continuing commitment to the preservation of printed works worldwide. We appreciate your understanding of the imperfections in the preservation process, and hope you enjoy this valuable book.

# THE AUSTRO-GERMAN HYPOCRISY

AND

## The Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church

BY

REVEREND PETER KOHANIK

*Canon of St. Nicholas' Russian  
Cathedral*



Published by the Russian Orthodox Catholic Mutual Aid  
Society of the United States of America

NEW YORK CITY

1915



Transferred to  
Librarian's Office



# The Austro-German Hypocrisy

## AND

### The Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church.

---

"Thou hypocrite! cast out first the beam out of thine own eye and then shalt thou see clearly to pull out the mote that ~~is~~ in thy brother's eye" (Luke vi, 42).

#### I

According to the statements of "Alsation" in the "New York Evening Telegram," January 14, 1915, there is now a German clique in New York circulating printed leaflets from Berlin and Bremen, marked "Widest circulation requested" and "Kindly circulate as much as possible," which are filled with misstatements as well as deliberate falsehoods.

The main purpose of these pamphlets and many Austro-German editorials, especially in the German "Staats-Zeitung," is to blame the present uncivilized European war on England and Russia in order to gain American sympathy. England's interests, as we know, are well taken care of against all kinds of Teutonic accusations, by her powerful American sympathizers, but little is heard in Russia's defense.

In view of the ignorant and unfounded attacks which have been made upon the Russian Greek Catho-

lic Church and the calumnies which have been hurled at Russia by the Pro-German agitators in this country, it is my purpose to make a few statements in defense of Russia and the Russian Church.

A few months since, Mr. Herman Ridder, of the "New York Staats-Zeitung," with the aid of the "German American Literary Defense Committee," reprinted in pamphlet form his editorials from the "Staats-Zeitung" (No. 209-247, Sept.-Oct., 1914) concerning Russia and the Russian Church in North America.

The title of the pamphlet is "The Great Conspiracy,"\* and is distributed free of charge throughout the United States. It is apparent to every broad-minded and sensible person who really knows Russia and her religion, that Herr Ridder and his Austrian associate-instigators, A. Szarsky and A. Konta, prepared this pamphlet especially to incite an active American hostility to Russia. In their persistent effort to awaken racial and religious animosities for the benefit of the Teutons, Herr Ridder and Co. attempt to establish the following propositions in the "Great Conspiracy";

1. That "two European countries—England and Russia—committed a monstrous crime and the most terrible catastrophe on hundreds of millions of people by deliberately and wantonly waging a war of conquest, unique in the history of the world."

2. That "Russia, the land of gloomy despotism and barbarism, with Czar Nicholas II—head of the Russian Church, has declared a holy war on civilized Christian nations";

3. That "the Russian Orthodox Church in North America and its clergy, ever since the sale of Alaska

---

\* This article originally appeared in "The New York Times," March 16, 1913, under the title, "Russia's Conspiracy Against Americanizing Aliens."

to the United States (Oct. 18, 1867), were political agents of the Russian Government; that their work in America is a deliberate and elaborately organized and financed campaign, not only for the conversion of the Slavic people to the Russian Orthodox Church, but, what is far more serious, for preventing them from becoming Americanized and loyal to the United States”;

4. That “the Russian Orthodox Church in North America, having no regular registered church membership, with Russian money poured out like water for the great orthodox cause, is attempting to win the Ruthenians (Russians from Austria, in forced religious union with the Roman Church since 1649) over to the Orthodox faith of Russia by the simple method of assuring them that their faith was identical with Russian Orthodoxy”;

5. That “the Ruthenians and all the true adherents of the Greek Catholic Ruthenian Church in Russia must pay with bitterest persecution and also with life itself for their loyalty.”

## II

### THE REAL CONSPIRACY OF THE GERMANS.

Either ignorance or malicious falsehood lurks in every word of the “Great Conspiracy.” It is impossible, however, in a brief space, to lay before the American public the real state of affairs in Russia and the sources of her power, which, could it be done, would disclose the loftiness and true nobility of the Russian national genius, and the deep-stored and spiritual religious treasury of the Russian people, and would immediately refute the puerile assertions of the Austro-German Russophobs that Russia is a barbarous, despotic country—a notion which, I fear, has received too much circula-

tion and even some acceptance among American newspaper readers. Notwithstanding the difficulty of removing this prejudice, I know that silence ceases to be golden in the face of so much cleverly directed denunciation and misstatement circulated; and it has seemed proper that a word of protest should be issued against the falsehoods of these detractors.

Ought Herr Ridder and his Austrian associates, throw stones at Russia and the Russian Orthodox Church, when they themselves are not "without sin"? I shall confine myself to facts. They hypocritically accuse Russia of an existing "conspiracy" against the United States, when their own countrymen are guilty of a real and shameful "passport conspiracy," the object of which is to perpetrate a fraud on the United States by buying American citizenship papers at \$20 each and passports at an additional \$20 for German reservists to enable them to return to Germany under the protection of the American flag. Those interested to know the details of the matter, should look up the "New York Times" of Jan. 3, 1915, which proves the "Passport Plot" and even gives the names of the four Germans arrested in New York Harbor with fraudulent passports.

It is true then that the Teutons not only in Russia, but, as the "Literary Digest" of January 9th, 1915, puts it, under the Special German Law of July 22, 1913, may become American (and other) citizens without sacrificing their German citizenship and allegiance.

That is why Herr Ridder, the German war lord in America and editor of the "New York Staats-Zeitung," calls upon all Teutons in the United States "to organize against the drift of public opinion in America toward Germany, stating at the same time that "there have been no traitors to the German cause either among the

66,000,000 Germans in the European 'Fatherland' or their descendants in the United States."

Oh, ye hypocrites! correct your own faults before criticizing others. Reverse your mental sight and be blind to the faults of others and quick to see your own failings.

### III

#### GERMAN KAISER—THE REAL AUTHOR OF THE PRESENT HORRIBLE EUROPEAN WAR.

Let us now examine the very contents of "The Great Conspiracy." It is absurd to blame Russia and its Emperor for having declared a "Holy War" on civilized Christian nations.

Allow me to recite some facts touching on and appertaining to this false accusation.

The Hon. J. M. Beck, former Assistant Attorney-General of the United States, who, as he states himself, has "a feeling of deep affection for the German people and an equal admiration for their ideals and matchless progress," presented in the "New York Sunday Times," October 25, 1914, in an article entitled, "In the Supreme Court of Civilization," his own views concerning the same question of *responsibility* for the present European conflict, but he justly puts the whole blame for the war not on Russia but on Germany.

Presenting the case, Mr. Beck asks: "If the evidence submitted by the official 'White,' 'Orange' and 'Gray' books of the warring nations were analyzed as a lawyer analyzes the evidence in his cases, who would be found responsible for the European War?"

His answer to this is: "Germany and Austria in a time of profound peace, secretly concerted to impose



their will upon Europe and upon Serbia in a matter affecting the balance of power in Europe.

"Austria having mobilized its army, Russia was reasonably justified in mobilizing its forces. Such act of mobilization was the right of any sovereign state, and as the Russian armies did not cross the border or take any aggressive action, no other nation had any just right to complain, each having the same right to make similar preparations.

"Germany, in abruptly declaring war against Russia for failure to demobilize when other Powers had offered to make any reasonable concession and peace parleys were still in progress, *precipitated the war.*"

If we will acquaint ourself with the "New York World's" article, Dec. 21, 1914, concerning Dr. Newell Dwight Hillis' sermon on the war, delivered by him on December 20, 1914, before a large gathering of Germans in Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, it will be evident to us that the Kaiser and no other person was responsible for the present war.

"Isn't it ridiculous," declared Dr. Hillis, "that Emperor Wilhelm—author of this horrible war—has been saying that God is on his side. God and he have been partners if you accept his statements."

Another eminent minister of New York, the Rev. Dr. C. E. Jefferson, in his pamphlet under the title of "The Cause of the War," p. 10, reminds us that "at the very beginning of the war, the Russian Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Sazonof, declared that it was a question of life or death for Russia whether Austria should be allowed to go on and crush Serbia under her heel. Russia has a double motive for fighting. She is fighting for herself and also for others. She is fighting for the rights of a little country (as England for the rights of little Belgium) which, when it had been bled white by two awful wars, was suddenly attacked

by an empire fifteen times its size. You cannot wonder then that all these peoples are fighting. They fight not because they are barbarians nor because they love war, but because they have been swept into war by forces which they were powerless to resist. Where shall we look for the culprit? Hardly in Russia.

"Study the face of Nicholas II (Czar of Russia). It is not the face of a warrior. It is the face, rather, of an artist or a poet. Remember that it was he who, impressed by the arguments of Jean de Bloch, called the first Hague Conference, some fifteen years ago,\* hoping that the nations might agree on a reduction in armaments.

"Read his telegram to his cousin, the King of England, in which he declared that he had done everything in his power to avert the war. Surely this is not a man who wanted to deluge Europe in blood, or who is to be held responsible for what is going on (in Europe)."

The biased critic will sneer at this, of course, and say there was a motive for him in proposing the universal peace, but it was ever thus—one can't please everybody.

## IV

### RUSSIA'S CULTURE.

Is Russia in reality a "land of gloomy despotism and barbarism," as the Austro-German hypocrites of New York declared her to be?

---

\* The Hague Tribunal was summoned by the present Russian Czar, to whom the world owes an unpayable debt. He desired the powers to "devise, if possible, a means to put an end to the incessant armaments, and to seek a means of warding off the calamities threatening the whole world." Twenty-six nations responded to his first call; to his second call no less than forty-four attended. May it be his privilege soon to call the third congress and thus, perhaps, perform the greatest service ever permitted to man. We have abolished slavery from civilized countries, the owning of man by man. The next great step which the world should take is to abolish war, the killing of man by man."—(Andrew Carnegie, in "War Abolished—Peace Enthroned," 1915, New York, N. Y.)



"It is a mistake for the Austro-Germans, or any other people, to imagine," as we are told by Mr. Hyacinthe Ringrose (an eminent attorney of New York City) in his excellent pamphlet, "Why is America Neutral?", "that they have a monopoly of culture, civilization or any other special advantage enjoyed by us poor humans. Every nation can justly boast of a galaxy of good, wise and talented men and women. It is a great mistake for the Germans to attempt to inject their particular brand of 'culture' into the Belgians by howitzers, or attempt to drop it in bomb capsules from Zeppelins upon the French, who are as fully cultured as any other race in Europe. *A nation represented by Pushkin, Turgeneff and Tolstoy in literature; by Kramskoy, Verestchagin and Glinka in art; and by Metchnikoff, Pavloff and Mendeleeff in science, can afford to have its culture compared with that of any other modern community.* Ideals count for more than ideas in a nation's development. The ideals of Russia are leading her slowly but surely to the highest plane of civilized culture. There are various forms of culture, and some of them are not signs of civilization.

"The burglar who pursues his trade scientifically, and the murderer who studies chemistry so as to speedily dispose of his victim, are both men of culture, but such culture is not needed in Russia or anywhere else. A book like that of 'The Next War' by General von Bernhardt would not be accepted in Russia as proof of its author's 'culture'; it would rather prove to the Russians that General von Bernhardt is a human bloodhound. In attacking Russians for their lack of culture the Germans say nothing of the unspeakable Turk, who has long been Germany's secret and underhand ally. Upon what theory of culture or civilization can Germany justify its dragging of the 'Sick Man of Europe'

into this conflict? 'The whole record of Germany's dealings and alliance with Turkey in the present world crisis has been criminal, underhand' and uncivilized.

## V

### OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST IS THE ONE TRUE HEAD OF THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH.

Another strange assertion of the Austro-German—springing either from gross ignorance or utter disregard of the truth—is that the Russian Emperor is the head of the Russian Orthodox Church.

A lay head of the Church! What a groundless accusation, based on complete ignorance of the real state of things! Whoever uses this expression without giving it full and thorough consideration and understanding, is using it as a weapon against the spiritual welfare of the Orthodox Church.

"It would be a great mistake to call the Emperor of Russia the head of the Russian Orthodox Church. He makes no such claim, and Russian Orthodoxy recognizes only one head of the Church, our Lord, and only infallible authority speaking in his name, the Seven First Ecumenical Councils. The Emperor may be the autocratic master of the Church; he is not the head of it. His authority is from the outside only. In questions of dogma he has no authority at all. He is regarded as the temporal defender and guardian of the church; his authority, and consequently the authority of the State, concerns the administration of the Church solely, and even here his power is limited by tradition, canon laws and the ecumenical character of the Church." (*The Russian Church*, by Hon. M. Baring, New York, p. 235.)

Anyone who is familiar with the history of the Russian Church and acquainted with her doctrines not from

hearsy, but from the Church's symbolical books, will need no proof to the above assertions of Mr. Baring. Indeed, the Russian Church knows of no such thing as "the Czar being the Head of the Russian Church," but knows, on the contrary, perfectly well that the Russian Church is ruled by an invisible Head, which is Jesus Christ, and that the organ through which He manifests His will is the Ecumenical Council or Synod of Bishops.

The Russian Emperor is merely, as a Christian sovereign, the supreme protector and guardian of the dogmas of the Orthodox faith, keeper of Orthodoxy and every decency in the Church (Vol. I, Sec. 42, Civil Code of the Russian Empire). In this sense the document of the Succession to the throne (Apr. 5, 1797, N-17910) calls the Emperor the Head of the Church.

In this legislative act the above expression has a meaning totally different from the one ascribed to it by all assailants of the Russian Church.

When, after many tribulations and sufferings, the Russian people, by common agreement (in 1613) chose Michael Romanoff for their hereditary monarch (such is the noble origin of the imperial power in Russia), they invested him with all the rights they possessed themselves.

By force of this election, the Monarch became the head of the people in Church matters, as in the matters of civic government.

The head of the people in Church matters and, in this sense, the head of the local Church, but in this sense alone.

The people did not hand over and could not hand over to their monarch rights in matters and conscience, dogmatic teaching and general discipline they did not possess themselves.

The people entrusted the Emperor of their choice

and his descendants with the right, or rather duty to see that the decisions of their pastors and councils should be carried out; with the right to defend the faith against all alien assaults and violence.

Never did a Russian Emperor consider himself, neither was he ever considered by any sensible Christian the head of the Russian Church in the sense that Roman Catholics consider the Roman Pope the head of theirs.

Never throughout the course of Russian history do we find a single example of a Russian Sovereign making an attempt to change anything either in the doctrines of the Church or in her ritual, or in her Sacraments. On the contrary, the Russian Emperors have always professed only what has been sanctioned by the Catholic Orthodox Church in her councils.

The Russian Emperor only assists the Church in matters of her administration, but (not being ordained to the ministry) does not rule her. Every year he humbly confesses his infirmities before a simple priest of the Church and accepts the holy Eucharist from him as all other lay members of the Church, which would be an absurd impossibility were he really the head of the Church.

Why do we never hear anybody speak, especially among Russians, about the Austrian Emperor as the head of the Catholic Church in Austria? In reality he possesses exactly the same power and the same rights in Roman Catholic and Uniate Churches of Austria as the Russian Emperor in the Orthodox Church of his country.

We all know that the Austrian Emperor not only approves and signs all documents pertaining to Church affairs, but also appoints Bishops to different episcopal sees and elects the deans and abbots. Without his sanction and knowledge no "bull" or "breve" of the Roman

Pope is allowed to be proclaimed or published for the Austrian Roman Catholics. From this point of view the Russian Emperor should also be called the head of the Roman Catholic Church in Russia, because he appoints Bishops for this Church. Besides, it is historically certified that even Pope Gregory VII, the infallible head of the Roman Church, was compelled to seek the consent of the German Emperor, Henry IV, before being vested with the papal dignity and office.

## VI

### GOVERNMENT OF THE RUSSIAN CHURCH.

The Russian Church was consecutively governed by three kinds of church government: the Metropolitan (up to 1589), the Patriarchal (from 1589), and the present Synodal (from 1721).

The collective Government of the Russian Church, under the title of the "Spiritual Collegium," afterwards changed to the Holy Synod, was confirmed in 1721, by an edict of Peter the Great.

The Patriarchal form of Church government was changed to the Synodal form for the following reasons:

1. "That the truth can be discerned much better by several people than by one: 'what one cannot grasp, another will \* \* \* so that a doubtful matter will be more clearly and rapidly explained, and it will not be difficult to see what direction should be taken';

2. "That the determinations and decisions of the collective authority have more weight and force, and will, therefore, be more rapidly obeyed than the decision of a single person;

3. "That when the Church power is centered in one person it can easily be mistaken for regal power."



The dignity of the Patriarch of the Russian Church was not abolished by the authority of the Emperors, but by the Eastern Patriarchs, who had founded the Russian Patriarchate.

This fact alone proves sufficiently that, as the head of the Church, the Emperor cannot be anything but the Head of the people in Church matters, and most assuredly as soon as this interpretation is accepted, all the accusations founded on the double interpretation will come to nothing.

In expressing their consent to the founding of a synod in Russia, the Eastern Patriarchs conferred on it an authority equal to the Patriarchal. Jeremiah, the Patriarch of Constantinople, wrote to the Russian Holy Synod: "By the grace and power of the Holy, Lifegiving and Supreme Spirit, our authority legalizes, confirms and proclaims the newly-founded Synod in the Great Kingdom of Russia. \* \* \* It is and accordingly is given the name of our brother in Christ, the Holy and Sacred Synod, and it has the power of doing and accomplishing, like unto the four Apostolic and Sacred Patriarchal Sees."

The Synodal Rule of the Church was founded by the Apostles themselves, who examined and decided the most important questions of faith and Church discipline collectively (The Acts 6-15).

According to Apostolic rules also, the supreme power of the Church must not belong even to the first amongst the bishops (still less to a King or Emperor who is a lay member), but to a council of Bishops (34 and 37 Apostolic Rules).

The Holy Synod of Bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church, in its organization and competence, has all the distinction of a strictly canonical institution. In accordance with Church rules concerning councils, its

members as well as those present must all be bishops. At the head of the Holy Synod stands the leading Metropolitan Bishop, but in conformity to the 34th Apostolic rule, he is only the first among equals in the power, standing as the presiding officer.

The Holy Synod (composed of the Metropolitans of Petrograd, Moscow and Kieff, the Exarch of the Caucasus, the Archbishop of Finland, and three or four other Archbishops or Bishops, elected semi-annually from different dioceses by the Synod itself) is the highest Church government in Russia, and not the Emperor. Certainly, there exists a complete, mutual interaction between the Church and the Imperial Government. By its moral influence, the Russian Church constantly works to uphold in society the proper respect and obedience toward lawful power and its institutions; and the imperial power, on the other hand, preserves the sanctity of the Orthodox faith, the order of the Church, its customs and regulations; cares for the religious education of the people, conserves the immunity of Church property, and sees to the material support of the Church and clergy.

## VII

### THE ESSENCE OF THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH'S WORK IN AMERICA IS NOT POLITICAL BUT PURELY SPIRITUAL.

The Teutonic hypocrites further assert that the Russian Orthodox Church in America is a political agency of the Russian Government, and that this church by its "*hidden*" religious work among the Slavic nationalities in America, *prevents* them from becoming loyal citizens of the United States.

What a mean and groundless accusation! All Russian Orthodox Christians as also all our American



friends, acquainted with the true missionary work of the Russian Church in North America know that the very essence of our mission here is not political, but purely spiritual, which is to bring the light of the true Orthodox faith in Jesus Christ to various Slavs, who formerly belonged to the Eastern Orthodox Church, but were forced a few centuries ago into the so-called UNIA with the Roman Church, the Jesuit fathers planning the whole thing in such a way, that the Uniats were sure to turn Roman Catholic sooner or later.

To achieve her high and sacred object, the Russian Orthodox Mission in America employs only lofty and purely spiritual means. Faith is a thing of the inner man; a man holds this or that faith because he feels attracted toward it in his heart. Consequently, in order that man may exchange one faith for another, he must be brought into a spiritual attitude which will make him indifferent toward his former faith, but fervently eager toward the new.

To achieve this, it is necessary to act directly upon the man's inner nature, in order that within him, in his own soul, there should begin a warfare against his own sinful will, and he should be brought thereby to realize his own self-deception, his own errors; so that he may accept the truth which is offered him not under the pressure of any external means and authority, but directly from inner necessity.

It follows that the righteous personal lives of missionaries, that the tears they shed for the kindness of men's hearts, their charity and exhortations, their arguments and humble preaching, their gentleness and loving kindness are the means the Orthodox Mission invariably employ in America and elsewhere for the conversion of Slavic and other peoples to its faith. Having no political objects, the Russian Orthodox Mission did not in

the past, and does not now strive to acquire or influence in political affairs. It does not look on the propagation of Orthodoxy as a means for the subjugation of Slavic or other nations, under the power of the Russian Government.

All this is the business of the State and its diplomatic missions—not the Church and its missionaries.

This fact was openly referred to by one of the foremost Russian missionary Bishops, the Right Reverend Nicholas, late of North America and Alaska, now Archbishop of Warsaw, in his farewell message to the Hon. William McKinley, then President of the United States: "Our Church *never* meddles with politics, and our Clergy never, either at home or anywhere else, have busied themselves with any intrigues of this description. It would be wrong to confound us with the Jesuits. Our Church allows us only to intercede for the oppressed or those that suffer innocently—as I have some times done before you—but it never allows us to incite citizens to revolt and treason."

The Russian Orthodox Missions throughout the wide world are entirely unaffected by political tendencies. Take, for example, the Russian Mission in Japan. In that country the late Right Reverend Archbishop Nicholas of Tokio built up, during the thirty years of his missionary work, a national Orthodox Church composed of 35,000 Japanese Christians. What enabled the Archbishop Nicholas to accomplish, single-handed, this great missionary labor? Only the fact that he always preached pure Christianity; striving to make Christians of the Japanese converts, in their own language and spirit, mixing into his work no political thoughts. The same can be said of the Russian Mission in North America. *Thousands of laymen and clergymen of the Russian Orthodox Church in the*

*United States are true and enthusiastic citizens of the Union*, all the younger generation, strictly attending the public and high schools, speak the English language more fluently than their native tongue. Throughout the hundred years of our Church's history in the United States, not a single Russian person ever was or could be accused of a political crime like the German falsification of citizenship papers and passports (see the "New York Times," Jan. 3, 1915).

Furthermore, while the Ruthenian-Uniat Church, of our Austro-German accusers, "no matter where located, clings to the old Slavonic language, the Russian Church *adopts the language* of the country (as we have seen in the case of Japan) in which it is located, which means that eventually it will adopt the English language for its services in America. Already it has (from 1906) a complete English edition of its Service Book ('Service Book of the Holy Orthodox-Catholic Apostolic Greco-Russian Church,' compiled, translated and arranged from the old Slavonic Service, by Isabel Florence Hapgood, New York, Houghton Mifflin & Co.).

"Will the American Uniats (Ruthenians) of the future be permitted to have their services, including their masses, in English? The children of foreign-speaking parents quickly forget their mother tongue in America. Seldom do we find the second generation of such children capable of fluently speaking and understanding the language of their grandparents, and when they of Ruthenian ancestry cease to understand the old Slavonic ritual, will they be obliged to go to the Latin Church, or lose their chances of heaven by ex-communication, or will Papal authority be given them to conduct their ritual in English?

"Should such authority not be given, and it seems

likely that it will not, will they prefer the Latin to the Russian Church, the Church of their forefathers, in which the time-tested and sacred Greek liturgy of the early Christian centuries has been and is kept in its purity in substance if not in language, and where this beautiful liturgy will be sung in the English language, permitting all English-speaking people to understand and join?" ("The Ruthenians and Their Church," by Hon. A. E. Oberlander, Gettysburg, 1912).

## VIII

### CHARACTERISTIC FEATURES OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Consider, on the other hand, the aims and purposes of the Roman Catholic faith of our hypocritical accusers in this matter. The characteristic feature of the activity of the Roman Pontiffs as early as the seventh and eighth centuries, was the tendency toward supremacy and universal dominion. Ever since that time, therefore, Roman Catholic nations became almost exclusively instruments for the propagation of the Papal power. Not Christian love, but direct violence was considered the best means for attaining their object, and it was not thought possible to accomplish it without the assistance of the royal power.

Latin missionaries were by no means averse to violent methods: the sword with them frequently took the place of Christian love, and the missionaries preached not so much Christ as the Pope. Religious wars, undertaken for the purpose of spreading Christianity and the Papal power, more common and habitual in the West. Converting to Christianity at that time meant subjugating, Latinizing and even on occasion, annihilating the nationality of a heathen people—"heathen" meaning "enemy."

Precisely such was the character of Charlemagne's wars against the Saxons. It was with the same object that crusades were undertaken against the Mohammedans in the twelfth and the following centuries.

In the Thirteenth century religious wars were conducted with the blessing of Popes, against the heretical Albigenses (1206-1228), and later against the Waldenses. The Thirty Years' War (between the Protestant and Roman Catholic leagues in Germany, later involving other countries. It began with the Bohemian war, 1618, and ended with the Peace of Westphalia, 1648) owed its beginning, its long duration and its religious character to the manipulations of Jesuit papal agents.

The religious war against the Huguenots in France (seventeenth century) was also their handiwork (see Prof. N. Krasnoseltzev's "Western Missions," Kazan, 1872).

From the year 1569, with the assistance of the Kings of Poland, the Papists began a general religious persecution of the Orthodox people in Western Russia and Austrian Galicia. Not being able to convert the Russian Orthodox Christians to Roman Catholicism by force, the Jesuits initiated the method of the religious Unia or of mutual concessions, in order to facilitate for the Russian people the transition to Romanism, adapting the latter to the ideas, the tastes and the dogmas of the people, concealing at first the real purpose of their Unia.

## IX

### NUMBER OF COMMUNICANTS OF THE EASTERN ORTHODOX GREEK CATHOLIC CHURCH.

The Austro-Germans further assert that the Russian Orthodox Mission in America has no registered Church

communicants, that for its "hidden" work here money is pouring like water from the Russian Government; that it is attempting to win the Little Russians (now called by the Romanists "Ruthenians") of Austria-Hungary over to the Orthodox faith of Russia by all means at its command, fair or unfair.

It is commonly supposed, that if men, especially such educated men as Herr Ridder and his Austrian associates, intend to make a public statement concerning some subject, they should thoroughly acquaint themselves with this subject first and then pronounce their judgment.

With our Teutonic assailants it is altogether different; they speak without any thorough knowledge and arrive at conclusions, having no foundation whatever.

In the Christian Herald Almanac for 1915, p. 43, the Russian Orthodox Church showed publicly and plainly that her Mission in America has a regularly registered membership of communicants. The following figures will give a fair idea of her registration:

Russians from Russia	- - - - -	50,000
Russians from Austria-Galicia	- -	20,000
Russians from Austria-Hungary	- -	14,000
Russians from Austria Bukowina	-	5,000
Crocles in Alaska	- - - - -	1,500
Aleuts in Alaska	- - - - -	1,500
Indians in Alaska	- - - - -	1,000
Eskimos in Alaska	- - - - -	800
Americans	- - - - -	254
Persians	- - - - -	77
Japanese	- - - - -	28
<hr/>		
Total	- - - - -	94,159



The membership of the whole Eastern Orthodox Greek Catholic Church throughout the world is estimated at over 137 millions.

In Russia: Russians - - - - -	80,000,000
Other nationalities - - - - -	28,000,000
Servians: In Servia - - - - -	2,300,000
Servians: In Austria - - - - -	3,500,000
Servians: In Macedonia - - - - -	400,000
Servians: In Montenegro - - - - -	225,000
Bulgarians: In Bulgaria - - - - -	3,500,000
Bulgarians: In Macedonia - - - - -	1,200,000
Bulgarians: In Tracia - - - - -	600,000
Roumanians: In Roumania - - - - -	3,000,000
Roumanians: In Austria-	
Bukowina - - - - -	2,300,000
Roumanians: In Russia - - - - -	1,000,000
Roumanians: In Macedonia - - - - -	300,000
Roumanians: In Bulgaria - - - - -	100,000
Greeks: in Greece - - - - -	2,250,000
Greeks and other nationalities in	
Turkey - - - - -	8,000,000
Syrians - - - - -	500,000
Japanese in Japan - - - - -	35,000
Syro-Chaldeans - - - - -	20,000
Chinese in China - - - - -	4,000
Total - - - - -	137,234,000

## X

### RETURN TO ORTHODOXY OF THE AUSTRO-RUSSIANS IN AMERICA.

It is perfectly true that the Russian Orthodox Mission in America is attempting to win the Russians of Austria-Hungary to her Orthodox faith, but only by proper, lawful and peaceful Christian means.



This holy work was started in the United States some twenty-four years ago by Russian "Uniate," descendants of Russians from Austrian Galicia and Hungary, who originally were Orthodox and at one with the Russian Orthodox Church, but since 1596 were driven by years of Roman Catholic oppression and scheming into submission to the Pope of Rome, though preserving features of their own faith. In 1891 a congregation was established in the city of Minneapolis, Minn., under the leadership of their faithful pastor, the late Very Rev. Archpriest Alexis G. Towt, from whom they first learned that all their forefathers were of the Orthodox faith.

The main cause of this movement was excellently described by Father Towt (see the "American Orthodox Messenger," N-20, 1889) in the following words:

"I was an Uniate when I came to America. Having been a professor of Church Law, I knew that here in America as an Uniate priest I was to obey the Roman Catholic Bishop of the particular diocese, in which I happened to work. The Unia demands this, as well as the various Papal Bulls, Brevets and Decretalia, as there was no Uniate Bishop in this country.

"Moreover, in my credentials ~~my~~ litteræ accreditivæ—the following instruction was clearly given: 'Dilectio tua debet semet personaliter coram Prasule istius Dioceseos presentare, in cuius territorio habetur locus destinationis suæ.' The place of my appointment was Minneapolis, Minn., in the province of Archbishop Ireland. As an obedient Uniate I complied with the orders of my Bishop, who at that time was John Valiy, and appeared before Bishop Ireland Dec. 19, 1889, kissed his hand according to custom and presented my credentials, failing, however, to kneel before him, which as I learned later was my chief mistake. I remember, that

no sooner did he read that I was a 'Greek-Catholic,' his hands began to shake. It took him fifteen minutes to read to the end, after which he asked abruptly—we conversed in Latin:

" 'Have you a wife?'

" 'No.'

" 'But you had one?'

" 'Yes, I am a widower.'

"At this he threw the paper on the table and loudly exclaimed: 'I have already written to Rome protesting against this kind of priests being sent to me!'

" 'What kind of priests do you mean?'

" 'Your kind.'

" 'I am a Catholic priest of the Greek Rite. I am an Uniat, and was ordained by a regular Catholic Bishop.'

" 'I do not consider that either you or this bishop of yours are Catholic; besides, I do not need any Greek Catholic priests here; a Polish priest in Minncapolis is quite sufficient; the Greeks also can have him for their priest.'

" 'But he belongs to the Latin Rite; besides, our people do not understand him and so they will hardly go to him; that was the reason they instituted a church of their own—'

" 'They had no permission from me and I shall grant you no jurisdiction to work here.'

"Deeply hurt by the fanaticism of this representative of Papal Rome, I replied sharply:

" 'In that case, I ask neither your jurisdiction nor your permission; I know the rights of my Church, I know the basis on which the Unia was established, and shall act accordingly.'

"The Archbishop lost his temper. I lost mine just

as much. One word brought another, the thing had gone so far that our conversation is not worth putting on record.

“Two days later, Jacob Pacholsky, the Polish priest, called on me. He spoke as if terror-stricken: ‘For God’s sake, your Reverence, what have you done? The Archbishop writes me I must have no intercourse with you. He does not accept you as a regularly ordained priest, and I am under strict orders from him to announce this at the altar, forbidding your people to be ministered to by you or to take sacraments from you—’

“This was my reply: ‘This is your concern. Do what you think is best. I shall not surrender one step and shall not be influenced by anything you and your Bishop can do.’

“The Archbishop’s demands were made public. He sent complaints to Rome, and my flock began to hear rumors which frightened them; the Archbishop, it was said, was going to send away their priest in ignominy, etc. In the meantime, I received letters from several of my fellow-priests of the Uniat Rite, who all wrote that there were a good many of us who had been treated by Latin BISHOPS and priests just as I had been. I informed the Uniat Bishop in Eperjes of all this, asking his instructions, but he never answered me. Naturally so! as if an Uniat Bishop dared to contradict a Latin Archbishop. I wrote a second and third time, still without obtaining any reply. At last I received from the Canon Joseph Dzubay the following instruction: ‘For God’s sake, be patient; and if the Archbishop doubts that you are a faithful Catholic, let him know that you are willing to take your oath on it!’

“After a while I received another letter from him, proposing that I should write a detailed account of the way the Archbishop received me and advising me to

write very carefully, as the letter was to be sent to Rome. This I did; but later on, the same Rev. Dzubyay informed me that the truth was too harshly stated in my letter for it to be sent to Rome. However, some measures had been taken and Rome was told that Latin Bishops must respect the Holy Unia.

"In the meantime, the convention of Wilkes-Barre took place October 15-27, 1890. The protocols of this Convention, the remonstrances of two Bishops, and my own complaints were answered in a single letter from Rome, that is, from the Propaganda Fide: all of us (priests) were to be recalled from America! What was to be done? I called my parishioners together and explained to them the sad position we were in, saying that under these conditions it certainly was best that I leave them.

"*'No,' said some of them, 'let us go to the Russian Bishop—why should we always bow before strangers.'*

"*'All right,' I said. 'But where does the Russian Bishop live? And what is his name?'*

"Having learned that the Russian Bishop resided in San Francisco, Cal. (at that time Bishop Vladimir), I made up my mind to do something which I carried in my heart a long time, for which my soul longed; that is, to become Orthodox. But how was it to be done? I had to be very cautious. The unfortunate Unia, the source of our decline and all our ills, had been part of our people too long. We had already borne that yoke on our shoulders for 250 years. I fervently prayed God to grant me the power to make all this clear to my unenlightened parishioners.

"The Lord heard my prayer: I began teaching my people and, later on, February 11, 1891, I was commissioned to see the Russian Bishop at San Francisco concerning our matter. Bishop Vladimir not only accepted

me, but came to us himself and received 361 of us into the Orthodox Church on the 25th of March, the very Sunday of the week of the Triumph of Orthodoxy. Our people, now informed and enlightened, rejected the false teaching of the Church of the Popes, and *we returned within the pale from which our forefathers were torn by means of deceit, flattery, hatred and violence. Glory be to our God for this mercy.*"

Once the Russian people from Austria-Hungary, who had been in a Union with the Latin Church for centuries, learned that their original religion was not the Unia but Orthodoxy, they began to come back to the Church of their forefathers by the thousands all over North America.

## XI

### THE ILL-FATED UNION WITH ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

It is an historical fact that Russia was enlightened in Christianity (in 988) according to the creed, rules, usages, ritual and dogma of the Greek Eastern Orthodox Church.

After the separation of the Western Church from the Eastern (1054), the Roman Popes pretended to get jurisdiction over the Russian Church. Its flourishing condition had already attracted notice, and Rome hesitated to commence the long series of attempts to bring it under her authority.

In 1075, Russian Prince Isiaslaw, driven from power by civil wars, obtained promises of support from Pope Gregory VII, upon condition that the Prince submit his kingdom and the Orthodox Church of Russia to the authority of the Roman see. It happened, however, that Isiaslaw regained his throne without foreign aid, and Gregory's scheme came to naught.



In 1204, the legate of Pope Innocent III offered to the Russian Prince Romanus of Galich, the protection of the Apostolic sword, but the Prince, pointing to his own sword, proudly asked: "Has the Pope any sword like this?"

Pope Innocent IV, seeing the distressed condition of the Eastern Orthodox Church (the Patriarch of Constantinople being in exile at Nice, and Russia having been ten years without a Metropolitan), sent to Daniel, Russian Prince of Galich (1245), the present of a regal crown, together with the proposition of a Union with the Roman Church, and a crusade against the Mongols.

Prince Daniel accepted the crown, and the title of King of Galich, but put off the proposition for a Union of the Churches.

The Papal legates also visited the court of Prince Alexander Nevsky (1253), and addressed him with flattering speeches, but Alexander refused decidedly either to receive their letters or listen to their solicitation.

When John Paleologus, King of the Greek Empire, was menaced by the Turks under Amurat II, turned to Europe for succor, Pope Eugenius IV, eagerly seized the opportunity thus presented of reconciling and uniting the Church of the East and the West, in the hope that the glory of this achievement, by re-establishing the supremacy of the Roman Popes over the whole Church, would redound to his advantage and silence all opposition to his claim to be its legitimate head.

He relied upon the support of Isidore, an adroit, ambitious schemer, Greek by nationality, personal friend of the Pope, whose influence is supposed to have assisted in his elevation to the exalted position of Metro-

politan of the Russian Church (at that time only Greek Bishops were appointed to rule the Russian Orthodox Church).

Pope Eugenius IV, although he himself was engaged in a contest with the Synods of Constance and Basil, respecting the Papal authority, nevertheless proposed to the Greek Emperor, John Paleologus, to call a council in Italy for the reunion of the Churches promising, if it were agreed to, to save Constantinople from the Turks. King John, together with the Greek Patriarch, Joseph, and the venerable body of clergy, sailed for Venice, but as Russia already composed the larger half of the Eastern Church, Isidore, the new Metropolitan, was also summoned to the council.

No more than four months had elapsed since his arrival in Russia from Greece when he began to seek permission of the Great Russian Prince Basil to go to the council, representing to him that all the sovereigns and primates of both Eastern and Western Churches were assembled to confer about the faith, and that it was not meet that Russia alone should have no representative there.

The Prince gave a reluctant consent to the departure of Metropolitan Isidore, beseeching him to stand firm in defense of the doctrines of Orthodoxy.

"Our fathers," said he, "and our ancestors would never listen to the reunion of the Greek and Latin religions, nor have I any such intention. Yet you may go, if such be your desire; I will not oppose your departure, but remember the purity of our faith and come back with it unsullied." (Karamzin, "History of Russia," Vol. V, p. 355).

The Russian Metropolitan Platon, in his Church History, remarks that "the pope, the most artful of men, seeing that Russia was the most powerful coun-



try which professed the Greek faith, persuaded Isidore, whose sentiments he knew, to get himself consecrated and sent as Metropolitan to Moscow, that he might assist at the council about to be held at Florence in subjecting both the Greek and Russian Churches to his Holiness' slippers, and that Isidore consequently got himself to be consecrated at Constantinople with the express intention of betraying the interests of the Church he had engaged to govern." The Council of Florence first met at Ferrara in 1438; adjourned to Florence and disbanded in 1439.

Its sessions were violent and stormy, its debates acrimonious and endless. Accord between the opposing parties which composed it was hopeless, but the Greek Emperor John and the Pope were determined not to lose the fruit of their labors and to secure, by any possible means, at least the semblance of a union of churches. The eloquent Mark, Metropolitan of Ephesus, thundered against the ambition of the Roman Pope and his new doctrines, but Vessarion, Metropolitan of Nice, and Isidore of Russia, inclined strongly to the interests of Rome.

At length Pope Eugenius obtained the upper hand, and declared beforehand the union of the churches on conditions favorable to Rome.

Mark of Ephesus was the only one who did not subscribe (Patriarch Joseph died in Florence before the end of the sessions) to the acts of the council; he devoted himself to become afterwards, in the East, the champion of Orthodoxy; for the other ecumenical Patriarchs rejected the Union of Florence and assembled in Constantinople, and condemned all its conventions and acts. The most important part of the acts of the council of Florence consisted of the following:

That the Pope of Rome is the Vicar of Jesus

Christ, the head of the Church on earth, and the Patriarch of Constantinople holds the second place after him." \* \* \* The emperor John returned home with presents, but without obtaining any support for his falling Empire. "The Greek Emperor," remarks the Russian Metropolitan Platon in his History, "was in the wrong to apply for assistance to the Pope, who had always been the sworn enemy of his religion; and would only have helped him if it could have promoted his own selfish ends; that he ought rather to have reformed his government and life, and turned together with his people to God, whose mercy would have been of more service to him than the pope."

Metropolitan Isidore received the title of "Cardinal Legate of the Apostolic See in Russia." He returned in triumph through Kieff to Moscow, bearing friendly letters from Pope Eugenius to the Great Prince of Russia.

At the first Divine liturgy in the Cathedral of the Assumption (in Moscow), Isidore ordered the Archdeacon to proclaim the acts of the councils of Florence, but was indignantly rebuked by Prince Basil, who publicly called him a traitor to the cause of Orthodoxy and a false pastor.

Prince Basil summoned the Bishops and boyars to meet and pass their judgment on the new doctrine. Not one of them would consent to acknowledge the Pope as the Vicar of Christ, and all of them, with one accord, rejected the Western doctrines.

Isidore was deposed and sentenced to confinement in the Chudof Monastery (1441); he escaped, however, from his prison and fled to Rome, where, by favor of the Pope, he was honorably received.

In 1467, Pope Paul III, induced Prince Ivan III to acknowledge the Union decreed by the council of

Florence, but his hopes met with disappointment. In 1519, Pope Leo X, offered Prince Vasily IV to raise the See of Moscow to a Patriarchate, preserving all the "allowable" practices of the Eastern Church, but Vasily, mindful of the "Tedeums" celebrated by Leo for the great victory of the Lithuanians over the "heretic" Russians at Orsha, declined his advances and refused others of a similar nature from Pope Clement VII.

In 1581, Pope Gregory XIII, through the Jesuit Anthony Possevin, urged Czar Ivan IV to recognize the fusion of the Churches promulgated by the Council of Florence, to enter into an alliance with other European powers, and thus array the whole Christian world in a crusade against the Turks, but his arguments fell on unwilling ears.

Czar Ivan ridiculed the Orthodoxy of Roman Christians whose Pope pretended to sit on a throne above kings and give them his toe to kiss. "We earthly sovereigns," said he, "alone wear crowns. The heir of the Apostles should be meek and lowly in spirit. We reverence our Metropolitan, and crave his blessing, but he walks humbly on earth, and seeks not, in pride, to raise himself above princes. There is but one Holy Father, and He is in heaven; who calleth himself the companion of Jesus Christ, but is carried on men's shoulders, as if borne upon a cloud by angels, is no true shepherd, but a wolf in sheep's clothing." (Karamzin "History of Russia," Vol. IX, p. 460). Possevin left Russia without having accomplished his object.

It is easy to see that all the efforts of the Latins to introduce Romanism or the union of churches into Russia could not but be wrecked against such unconquerable hostility on the part of the Russians.

Well aware that Orthodox Russia could not be

converted directly to Romanism, the Popes took hold of the Unia and began to clear the way for it in the Western parts of present Poland, in Austrian Galicia and Hungary.

The chief promoters of the Unia at that time were Cyrill Terletzky, Bishop of Loutsk, who was severely reproved by the Patriarch of Constantinople for his vicious life, and Hypatius Potsey, Bishop of Vladimir, previously a Roman priest of Brest, a faithful ally of Cyrill. Like Isidore before them, they both entertained the idea of adhering to the Roman Church; thereby hoping to obtain the powerful protection of the Polish King Sigismund III (1590), a blind zealot of Rome.

Potsey and Terletzky fraudulently obtained the signatures of Gedeon Balaban, Bishop of Lwow, and Michael Copistensky, Bishop of Peremyshl, to a clean sheet of paper, upon which they pretended they were going to write a petition to the Polish King for new privileges to the Orthodox Church; and then, instead of this, they wrote, as in the name of a Synod, a request to him and the Pope for a religious union of the Orthodox Church with the Roman, on the terms of the council of Florence, but with conservation of all the discipline and ceremonies of the Eastern Church.

Aided by King Sigismund III, Terletsky and Potsey went to Rome as representatives of the whole Russian Orthodox Church, and, before Pope Clement VIII, Dec. 23, 1595, testified their submission and allegiance to the Roman Catholic Church.

All the Clergy of Western Russia were brought into agitation by this act, and having assembled in 1596 at Brest, were divided in their sentiments. Some remained unshaken in their Orthodoxy; others, with the two instigators, inclined to Rome.

Accepted by only a few Bishops, the Unia was op-

posed unanimously by the laity. In view of this, it was intended to exert pressure on them by violent measures. Riots, violences and bloodshed marked the course of the Unia for many years; churches, convents and houses of worship were destroyed and sealed up, and these acts were frequently accompanied by shameful robberies, cruelty and even the murder of Russian Orthodox people. Parish priests and teachers, on account of their attachment to their Orthodox faith, were persecuted by the Roman clergy, and the adherents of the Unia (Krasinsky, "History of Poland," p. 139, V. 2, 1840, London).

The Uniat Archbishop Josaphat Kuntzevich, of Polotzk, a prelate of irreproachable life, but blindly devoted to the interests of Rome, persecuted the Orthodox Russian people with particular severity.

Leon Sapega, chancellor of Lithuania, strongly represented to Kuntzevich the danger of his proceedings, which he described to him as not only impolitic, but also as un-Christian. On the 12th of March, 1622, Sapega wrote to him: "By the abuse of your authority, and by your actions, which originate rather in vanity and personal hatred than in charity towards your neighbors, and are contrary to the laws of our country, you have kindled those dangerous sparks which may produce an all-consuming fire. Obedience to the laws of the country is more necessary than the union with Rome. \* \* \* *A general Union can be promoted by charity only, and not by force.* \* \* \* You inform me that your life is in danger, but I think that it is your own fault. You say that you must seek defense against the agitators; Christ being persecuted, did not seek for it, but prayed for his persecutors; so ought you likewise to act, instead of scattering offensive writings, or uttering menaces, of which the Apostles have left no example. Your sanctity assumes that you are per-



mitted to despoil schismatics and to cut off their heads; the gospel teaches the contrary.

"This union has created great mischief; you offer violence to conscience, and you shut churches (Orthodox) so that the Christians perish like infidels, without worship or sacraments. Whom have you converted (to the Unia) by your severities? You have alienated the hitherto loyal Cossacks; you have converted sheep into goats; you have drawn danger on the country, and perhaps even destruction on the Catholics. *The Unia has not produced joy, but only discord, quarrels and disturbance. It would have been much better if it had never taken place.*

"Now, I inform you that by the King's command, the churches (Orthodox) must be opened and restored to the Greeks that they may perform divine service. We do not prohibit Jews and Mohammedans from having their places of worship, and yet you are shutting up Christian temples." (Vishnevsky, "History of Polish Literature," V. 8, p. 498-503.)

Notwithstanding this true Christian letter of Chancellor Sapega, Archbishop Kuntzevich pursued his career of oppression until the inhabitants of Vitebsk rose and murdered him, on the 12th of July, 1628, by dragging his body to the banks of the river Dwina, and throwing his body, with a stone tied to his neck, into the river.

For his bravery (in murdering the Orthodox Christians) in propagating the Unia, the Roman Church canonized him (1643) as a saint of the Uniat Church.

The same Unia was enforced among the Russian Orthodox people in present Austro-Hungary—in Hungary, in 1649, in the City of Ungvar; in Galicia: in the Diocese of Peremyshl, 1691; in the Diocese of Lwow,



1700. After the partition of Poland (in 1772, 1793, 1795), the Russian Uniates of the present western Russia, being at liberty to follow the dictates of their own consciences, threw off the Roman allegiance and returned to Orthodoxy—the faith of their forefathers:

- (a) at the end of Catherine II reign—3,000,000 souls
- (b) In 1829—1,600,000 souls
- (c) In 1875—50,000 souls

Pope Gregory XVI (1846) issued, against the reunion, an ineffectual allocution; but the public opinion of Europe saw, in the return of Uniates, a case of historical justice.

While four and one-half millions of Russian Uniates (in western Russia) returned to the faith of their forefathers, the four millions of Russian Uniates in Austrian Galicia and Hungary, at present falsely named as “Ruthenians,” still remain in religious submission to Rome. In America, during the past twenty-five years, through the peaceful efforts of the Russian Orthodox Mission, over 50,000 Austrian Uniates returned to the Orthodox faith. The main reason why the greater portion of Austrian-Russians still adhere to the Unia is because their clergy, partly on account of their persecution by the Austrian civil authorities, partly on account of their hypocrisy, make them “*to believe they are (Orthodox in faith) what they are not, when in fact they are what they do not believe they are.*”

“As the test of the Roman Church is its doctrines or creed and not rituals and ceremonies, *the Uniates are Roman Catholics and not Greek Catholics*; they are ‘Roman Catholics of the Ruthenian rites.’ It is this lack of understanding and other causes such as the introduction of their home politics (Austrian Ukranizm, Mazepinism) into America, that has caused so much trouble among them in the past five or six years. It

was chiefly because of this misnomer 'Greek Catholic' that whenever a Roman Catholic Bishop of the Latin rite, in America, sought jurisdiction over them they protested and rebelled.

*"The laity do not seem to understand the ecclesiastical standing of their Church, its relation to Rome; they do not understand they are united, annexed, adjoined and incorporated into the Roman Church."* (Ruthenians, A. F. Oberlander, p. 23, Gettysburg.)

In reality they are not "Greek" by faith, but Roman, with Latinized Greek rites and ceremonies. The Right Rev. Phelan, late Roman Catholic Bishop of Pittsburgh, in his pastoral letter to the clergy and laity (see "Pittsburgh Post," November 12, 1904), made the following statement about the Uniates: "Among Catholics who do not use the Latin rite, the Catholics who use the Greek or Ruthenian rite are the most numerous in our diocese. It is a misuse of words and terms to say that some of the clergy and laity of the diocese are Roman Catholics and some Greek Catholics. All the faithful who are in the unity of the visible Church of Christ, and in the obedience to his Vicar, the Bishop of Rome, successor of St. Peter, are Roman Catholics. Some are Catholics of the Latin rite, some are Catholics of the Greek (Ruthenian) rite—but all are *Roman Catholics.*"

It is evident that the Unia is a means of keeping under spiritual subjection to the Roman Church people who, having received from the East the imperishable doctrines and primitive rites of the Christian faith, and with them the means of profiting by an intelligible church service in their tongue, did not choose, for the sake of any worldly advantages, to part with those holy pledges of the salvation of their souls.

## XII

### FACTS ABOUT THE MONEY QUESTION.

The Austro-German agitators declare in "The Great Conspiracy" that, for the purpose of winning the Austro-Russian Uniates of America over to the Orthodox faith, "Russian money is poured out like water."

It is true that the Russian Orthodox Mission here (as the missions of other denominations throughout the world) receives a yearly subsidy of seventy thousand dollars (for traveling expenses, maintenance of her Consistory, Bishop's headquarters, Seminary, Indian, Eskimo and other poor parishes).

This sum of money is sent yearly from the Russian Missionary Society of Moscow and from the special funds of the Holy Synod.

The Russian Mission in America has 215 churches and 87 chapels and mission stations, of which over 200 are self-supporting. If we will consider the great moral and spiritual work of the Russian Church among the American Russians and compare it with the little sum of money received by her for this purpose, we would be amazed, inasmuch as the whole sum given is but a drop in the bucket in comparison to her needs and growth in North America.

## XIII

### RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION OF THE AUSTRO-RUSSIAN UNIATES BY THEIR TEUTONIC GOVERNMENT.

Regarding the statement of "The Great Conspiracy" that "all the true adherents of the Greek Catholic Ruthenian Church in Russia must pay with bitterest persecution and also with life itself for their loyalty,"

I must say that the Russian history does not know of such fictitious persecutions of Greek Catholic Ruthenians.

In conclusion, as the history of the Russian people is so little known, I have tried to show that the Russian Orthodox Church in North America is in no way to blame for practises of which it is accused in "The Great Conspiracy" by the Austro-Germans. In reality the truly Christian religion as well as the nobility of the hearts of the Russian people would prevent them from even thinking of such a transgression (as declared by the Austro-Germans) against the United States which enables them to fulfill freely the sacred commandment: "Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him, let him know that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sin." (James, v, 19-20.)

How the Austro-Germans can dare to accuse the Russian Government for a fictitious persecution of Ruthenian Greek Catholics, not seeing at the same time the real persecution of Russians in Austria, I can't imagine!

Take, for instance, the "London Times" for April and May, 1912, and you will be surprised to learn that the tolerant (?) Austrian constitution which provides for complete freedom of conscience for all her subjects, is trodden under foot when it concerns the Russian Uniates of Austria.

"Russian schools," declares the "Times," "however private, are not allowed; Russian books are confiscated, and boys found reading a Russian author are expelled from the gymnasiums. At the elections, whether Parliamentary or provincial, Russian voters are either prevented by troops from entering the polling booths, or

the result of the election is falsified. In matters religious their state is even worse.

"An ex-officer of cavalry, a certain Count Sheptitski, has been appointed Metropolitan for the Russian Uniates of Galicia, and is doing all he can (in Austria himself, and in the United States is striving through his assistant, Ruthenian Bishop Soter Ortinsky, of Philadelphia) to Polonize and Latinize his Russian flock, of which he has proved himself to be not the shepherd, but the wolf.

"The 'Uniate' priests who remain faithful to the ancient Slavonic liturgy so loved by the people, are being harshly persecuted (at the beginning of the European war, hundreds of such priests were not only thrown into prison, but even were shot and hanged like the worst criminals); new customs and ceremonies, abhorred by the people, are being introduced, and celibacy is being forced on the clergy."

The Russian Uniates of Austria, learning from Orthodox missionaries that, while they are Uniates, they are not Orthodox, started a strong religious movement in favor of Orthodoxy.

"Village after village," as the "London Times" admitted, "has declared itself to a man no longer 'Uniat' but Orthodox. The movement began in 1903, when the large villages of Zaluchie and Grab in Galicia joined the Orthodox Church, and though men have been imprisoned and Austrian soldiers quartered upon the villagers, the peasants have remained firm. In Hungary, a similar movement to that in Galicia broke out even earlier, more than ten years ago, because the Government began to substitute Hungarian for the Slavonic language of the church service."

A prominent Englishman, W. J. Birkbeck, M. A. F. S. A., went to Austrian Galicia in 1912 to investigate the truthfulness of the Austrian persecutions.

On his return from Austria he openly wrote in his pamphlet, entitled, "Religious Persecution in Galicia":

"I saw and talked with some forty peasants of the village of Grab. The cause of all the trouble there has been the priest, Kiselevsky, who has been forced upon them, and who is a violent Latinizer, and bitter Ukrainophil politician. I heard their complaints against his conduct, in and out of Church, which were both varied and numerous. I cannot now go into them all. The two last straws seem to have been, firstly, that in 1910 he had arbitrarily cut the word "Orthodox" out of the prayer at the Great Entrance in the Liturgy: 'May the Lord God remember all of you Orthodox Christians in his Kingdom,' although it is printed in the service books which by the written law of his Church he is bound to use at the altar; and, secondly, that he had refused to register the people in the parish list as Russians. *'We were always Russians and Orthodox, and so were our fathers and forefathers before us; we know now that Ukrainism is a bridge to make Poles of us, and that the Unia is a trap to turn us to Papists. We have left the Unia forever, and they may fine us and rob us of our cattle, or even hang us and cut us up, but we will never go back to it,—thus spake the people.*

"THEY had invited an Orthodox priest, Sandovich, a native of the village of Zdynia, 12 werst away, to come and minister to them, giving him a house and some land, and themselves providing for his maintenance. The local authorities, in spite of the Austrian Constitution providing for perfect religious liberty, had refused them permission to build a Church. The services, held in a private room, had been constantly interfered with by the gendarmes, who, after having brought Father Sandovich into Court, and having got him fined on various occasions, had on Easter Day last, surround-



ed the house while he was celebrating the Holy Communion and arrested him immediately afterwards, and he was thrown into prison at Lemberg and after being kept there for over a year, was shot two months ago (in view of his wife) by the prison wall.

"The peasants of that village—men, women and children—have been summoned before the tribunal of Jaslo, thirty miles distant across the hills, deep in snow. Three times they have been brought on foot to Jaslo and three times has the case been postponed. 'Come back to the Uniat Church,' say the police, 'and we will trouble you no more; when your children begin to die of the frost and fatigue you will be sure to yield.' But these Russian mountaineers will not yield. 'You can take our money and our cattle, and our goods, persecute and imprison us, but we will starve to death first than go back to the Uniat Church.'"

From the above it is evident that the noble work of the Russian Orthodox Church of America, with regard to the Unia, is a clear work and historically correct, and such it shall remain forever, whatever the accusations of its enemies and the coloring they are trying to put on the cause of the return of the Russian Uniates of Austria-Hungary to the Orthodox Church.

The fate of nations can show no truth superior to the truth of history. Orthodoxy has watched the true interests of the Slavic nations from the beginning of centuries; for this reason the Unia, always was a sore subject with it, as the means of turning Slavs astray into Roman Catholicism, and possibly making them take sides against the Slavs with the Austro-Germans (we see this on all Austrian Ukrainophils), who are the bitterest enemies of the Slavs.

"Refined diplomacy is used by the Uniat leaders against the Orthodox Church, both in Austria and in

America. The main part of this diplomacy is enclosed in forcing a language (Ukrainian) upon the Russian population of Austria which the Polish majority in the local Galician Parliament has made official, but which is not actually the language of any part of Galicia, and which is actually unintelligible. This 'language' is an amalgam of three Little Russian dialects spoken in Galicia, as well as of other dialects spoken in Little Russia, with a liberal admixture of Polish words and expressions. It is, in fact, an artificial jargon, a sort of local Esperanto; and the main object both of *its structure and of its orthography, is to construct something which shall be as different as possible from ordinary literary Russian, in order that, by forcing this upon the children in the schools and in their religious instruction, the authorities may gradually render Russian literature inaccessible to them, and then, by means of books of devotion containing Latin prayers translated into the new language, sever them from the Orthodox traditions hitherto preserved in their church.* The process involves the further result that it likewise cuts them off from being able to read or understand the old Slavonic in which (as in Russia) their services are read. This policy of the Poles, of course, suits the Jesuits very well, as, if it ever succeeded, and the people could no longer understand what was being read in Church, it would afford an excellent excuse for the substitution of the Latin for the Slavonic language."—(Religious Persecution in Galicia, by W. J. Birkbeck, London, 1912.)















0 015 900 768 6



CPA information can be obtained  
at [www.ICGresting.com](http://www.ICGresting.com)  
Printed in the U.S.A.  
BVOW09\*1233261117

501182BV00007B/182/P



9 781296 743260









This work has been selected by scholars as being culturally important, and is part of the knowledge base of civilization as we know it. This work was reproduced from the original artifact, and remains as true to the original work as possible. Therefore, you will see the original copyright references, library stamps (as most of these works have been housed in our most important libraries around the world), and other notations in the work.

This work is in the public domain in the United States of America, and possibly other nations. Within the United States, you may freely copy and distribute this work, as no entity (individual or corporate) has a copyright on the body of the work.

As a reproduction of a historical artifact, this work may contain missing or blurred pages, poor pictures, errant marks, etc. Scholars believe, and we concur, that this work is important enough to be preserved, reproduced, and made generally available to the public. We appreciate your support of the preservation process, and thank you for being an important part of keeping this knowledge alive and relevant.



9 781296 743260



08-CXW-762